



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/531,515

06/16/2006

Francesca Frigerio

PC/4-32727A

9099

75074

7590

03/10/2008

NOVARTIS INSTITUTES FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH, INC.
400 TECHNOLOGY SQUARE
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

EXAMINER

SWOPE, SHERIDAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1652

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/531,515	Applicant(s) FRIGERIO ET AL.	
	Examiner SHERIDAN SWOPE	Art Unit 1652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

All documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement(s) have not been filed. If Applicants wish for all documents to be considered, they should be filed.

Election/Restrictions

Claims 1-26 are pending.

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, Claims 1-6, drawn to a method for identifying a weight disorder treatment agent, wherein the method identifies a modulator of S6 kinase activity.

Group II, Claims 7-9, drawn to a method for identifying a weight disorder treatment agent, wherein the method identifies a modulator of S6 kinase transcription.

Group III, Claim 10, drawn to an S6 kinase modulator.

Group IV, Claim 11, drawn to a method of reducing adipocyte size using an S6 kinase inhibitor.

Group V, Claims 12-17, drawn to a method for treating fat accumulation by administering an S6 kinase modulator.

Group VI, Claims 18-21, drawn to a method for making a medicament using an S6 kinase modulator.

Group VII, Claim 22, drawn to an RNA.

Group VIII, Claims 23-25, drawn to a diagnostic method measuring S6 kinase activity.

Group IX, Claim 26, drawn to a kit comprising an adipocyte.

For each of Inventions I-IX above, restriction to two of the following is also required under 35 USC 121. Therefore, election is required of one of Inventions I- IX and one of Inventions (A)-(J), as follows.

Art Unit: 1652

If Group III is elected, elect one of:

- (A) Modulator of enzyme activity
- (B) Modulator of transcription

If Group IV is elected, elect one of:

- (C) A cellular method
- (D) An in vivo method

If Group IV is elected, also elect one of:

- (E) Inhibitor of enzyme activity
- (F) Inhibitor of transcription

If Group V is elected, elect one of:

- (G) Modulator of enzyme activity
- (H) Modulator of transcription

If Group VII is elected, elect one of:

- (I) SEQ ID NO: 1
- (J) SEQ ID NO: 2

The inventions listed as Groups I-IX(A)-(J) do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature for the following reasons: The technical feature linking Groups I-IX appears to be that they all related to S6 kinase. However, S6 kinase was known in the art. Moreover, Bjorbaek et al, 2000 (IDS) teach use of an S6 kinase modulator for making a medicament (Claim 1 therein), which anticipates Claim 18 herein. Therefore Groups I- IX share no special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not define a contribution over the prior art. Furthermore, the products of Groups III, VII, and IX do not share a special common structural and functional feature while, the methods of Groups I, II, IV-VI, and VII do not use the same reagents or produce the same results. In addition, the methods of Groups I, II, IV-VI, and VII do not comprise all of the methods for making or using the products of Groups III, VII, and IX. Accordingly, Groups I-IX are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

Searching more than one of Groups I-IX(A)-(J) would represent a burden on the Office for the following reasons. Because the products of Groups III, VII, and IX do not share a special structural and functional feature, a search for any one said product would not encompass a search for any other said products. Thus, a search for more than one of the products of Groups III, VII, and IX would be a burden on the Office. A search for any one of the methods of Groups I, II, IV-VI, and VII would not encompass a search for any other said methods because the methods do not share a special technical feature of steps and products used, or results produced. Thus, the search for more than one of Groups I, II, IV-VI, and VII would be a burden on the Office. A search of any one of the products of Groups III, VII, and IX would not encompass a search of

Art Unit: 1652

any of the methods of Groups I, II, IV-VI, and VII, or vice versa, because said methods are not the only methods of making or using said products. Thus, a search of any one of the products of Groups III, VII, and IX with any of the methods of Groups I, II, IV-VI, and VII would be a burden on the Office.

These inventions lack Unity of Invention for the reasons given above. Furthermore, each invention has acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter and, thus, searching more than one invention would be a burden on the Office. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes, as indicated, is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention and sub-invention(s) to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the Official Gazette notice dated March 26, 1996 (1184 O.G. 86; see also M.P.E.P. 821.04, In re Ochiai, and In re Brouwer). Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right, if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. To be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the

Art Unit: 1652

currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Final Comments

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

To insure that each document is properly filed in the electronic file wrapper, it is requested that each of amendments to the specification, amendments to the claims, Applicants' remarks, requests for extension of time, and any other distinct papers be submitted on separate pages.

It is also requested that Applicants identify support, within the original application, for any amendments to the claims and specification.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheridan L. Swope whose telephone number is 571-272-0943. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F; 9:30-7 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Nashed can be reached on 571-272-0934. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published application may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on the access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/SHERIDAN SWOPE/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1652